D2D-U: Device-to-Device Communications in Unlicensed Bands

Hongliang Zhang, *Student Member, IEEE*, Yun Liao, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Lingyang Song, *Senior Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1610.04982v1 [cs.NI] 17 Oct 2016

Abstract

Device-to-Device (D2D) communication, which enables direct communication between nearby mobile devices, is an attractive add-on component to improve spectrum efficiency and user experience by reusing licensed cellular spectrum. Nowadays, LTE-unlicensed (LTE-U) emerges to extend the cellular network to the unlicensed spectrum to alleviate the spectrum scarcity issue. In this paper, we propose to enable D2D communication in unlicensed spectrum (D2D-U) as an underlay of the uplink cellular network for further booming the network capacity. A sensing-based protocol is designed to support the unlicensed channel access for both LTE users and D2D pairs, based on which we investigate the subchannel allocation problem to maximize the sum rate of LTE users and D2D pairs while taking into account their interference to the existing Wi-Fi systems. Specifically, we formulate the subchannel allocation as a many-to-many matching problem with externalities, and develop an iterative user-subchannel swap algorithm. Analytical and simulation results show that the proposed D2D-U scheme can significantly improve the network capacity.

Index Terms

Device-to-Device Unlicensed, Carrier aggregation, Resource allocation, Matching theory

H. Zhang, Y. Liao, and L. Song are with School of Electronics Engineering and Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing, China (email: {hongliang.zhang,yun.liao,lingyang.song}@pku.edu.cn).

I. Introduction

With the explosive growth of mobile devices and bandwidth-hungry applications such as video streaming and multimedia file sharing, user demands for mobile broadband are undergoing an unprecedented rise, which pushes the limits of current cellular systems [1]. To improve spectrum efficiency and user experience, device-to-device (D2D) communications underlaying cellular networks have been proposed as a promising approach to facilitate high data rate services in a short range and boost the performance of LTE systems [1]–[3]. D2D communications underlaying cellular networks enable mobile devices in proximity to establish a direct link without traversing the base station (BS), and reuse the spectrum with the cellular system by the control of the BS [4]–[7]. With the centralized control at BS and the proximity of communication parties, D2D communications enjoy the benefits of fast access to the radio spectrum in terms of proximity gain, reuse gain, and paring gain [3]–[5].

In addition to excavating more capacity on licensed spectrum, the operators are motivated to expand cellular services to unlicensed spectrum to alleviate congestion. Mobile traffic offloading is a conventional method, in which the cellular data is offloaded to Wi-Fi networks [8]–[11]. However, the offloading schemes commonly suffer from low efficiency and poor guarantee of quality-of-service (QoS) due to the inferior performance of Wi-Fi and the lack of coordination between cellular and Wi-Fi systems [12]. In light of these issues, the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) has initialed the research on licensed assisted access (LAA) to integrate the unlicensed carriers with the licensed ones for data transmission [13]. Based on the LAA scheme, the LTE-unlicensed (LTE-U) technology is proposed to extend LTE to the unlicensed spectrum to leverage the existing carrier aggregation (CA) technology [14], [15].

As LTE-U technology shows satisfying performance, a natural idea to further improve spectrum efficiency and system throughput is to combine the advantages of D2D communications and LTE-U technology. However, due to the mutual interference among LTE-U network, D2D pairs, and the opportunistic feature of unlicensed channel access in existing Wi-Fi systems, this combination turns out to be much complicated. In this work, we investigate the extension of the underlaid D2D communications to LTE-U networks, which we refer to as D2D-Unlicensed (D2D-U). Different from most previous peer-to-peer communication technologies in unlicensed spectrum such as Wi-Fi Direct [16]–[18], which builds the network upon the IEEE 802.11 infrastructure mode

and allows users to negotiate with each other in an AP-like method, D2D-U requires assist and control from the central BS. With the involvement of BS, D2D users can work as an underlay of LTE system in both licensed and unlicensed spectrum.

As aforementioned, the major challenges of implementing D2D-U are (1) the opportunistic feature of unlicensed channel access due to current 802.11 mechanism adopted by Wi-Fi systems; and (2) the interference management issue among the three types of systems, i.e., the access and transmission of D2D-U users cannot cause too much additional interference to the existing Wi-Fi system as well as the LTE-U system. To cope with the first challenge, we design an access protocol in the unlicensed bands for D2D-U pairs and LTE-U users, which is based on the listen-before-talk (LBT) mechanism, to mitigate collision with the ongoing Wi-Fi transmissions. To deal with the second challenge, we first elaborate an approximated model to evaluate the interference to Wi-Fi networks. Then, we investigate the subchannel allocation problem to leverage the maximization of the sum-rate of LTE-U and D2D-U users and the protection of Wi-Fi performance. This subchannel allocation problem is originally a mixed-integer non-linear programming (MINLP) problem, which is generally NP-hard. For this reason, we reformulate it as a many-to-many game with externalities [19]–[23], and solve it with low computational complexity by designing an iterative user-subchannel swap-matching algorithm.

The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follow.

- We propose a feasible LBT-based D2D-U protocol for the LTE-U and D2D-U users to utilize the unlicensed spectrum.
- An approximated model is elaborated to evaluate the interference to Wi-Fi networks introduced by the LTE-U and D2D users occupying the unlicensed bands.
- We investigate the subchannel allocation problem by a many-to-many matching game with externality, and provide analysis regarding the stability, convergence, complexity, and optimality of the algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the system model for the coexistence among LTE, D2D, and Wi-Fi users, as well as their PHY/MAC features. In Section III, a D2D-U protocol is elaborated to support LTE-U and D2D-U users accessing the unlicensed spectrum. Then we discuss the interference issue and formulate the optimization problem for subchannel allocation in Section IV. In Section V, the problem is reformulated as a many-to-many matching game with externalities, with an iterative algorithm and its property



Fig. 1. System model for LTE, D2D, and Wi-Fi coexistence in both licensed and unlicensed spectrum.

analysis. In Section VI, the system performance is discussed. Numerical results in Section VII evaluate the proposed algorithm and the performance of the D2D-U. Finally, conclusion remarks are drawn in Section VIII.

II. System Model

In this section, we present the coexistence scenario of LTE, D2D, and Wi-Fi systems in both licensed and unlicensed spectrum. Then, the characteristics of LTE, D2D, and Wi-Fi systems in the MAC and PHY layers are elaborated respectively. Furthermore, we discuss the interference issue within the coexistence network at the end.

A. Scenario Description

As shown in Fig. 1, we consider an uplink scenario in a cellular network with one BS and Q Wi-Fi access points (APs), denoted by $\mathcal{Q} = \{1, \ldots, Q\}$. The BS is located at the center and the APs are randomly located around the BS. There exist N LTE users, denoted by CU_n $(n \in \mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, N\})$, and M D2D pairs, denoted by $\left(\text{D}_m^t, \text{D}_m^r\right)$ $(m \in \mathcal{M} = \{1, \ldots, M\})$, where D_m^t and D_m^r represent the transmitter and receiver of D2D pair D_m, respectively. The cellular system owns licensed spectrum, and the bandwidth is divided into K subchannels to support orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA) transmissions. The licensed subchannels are denoted by $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \ldots, K\}$, with uniform bandwidth B_l.

For the Wi-Fi system, we assume that within the coverage of AP$_q$ ($q \in \mathcal{Q}$), there exist F_q Wi-Fi users marked by WU$_f^q$ ($f = 1, \ldots, F_q$). All the APs as well as the Wi-Fi users operate on the same unlicensed channel, and each transmission attempt occupies the whole bandwidth of the channel. Since the unlicensed channel is much wider than one licensed subchannel in LTE system, each LTE-U user or D2D pair only requires a fraction of the unlicensed channel. Thus, to reuse the unlicensed channel more efficiently, the unlicensed channel is divided to K^u unlicensed subchannels with bandwidth B_u [24], marked by $\mathcal{K}^u = \{K+1, \ldots, K+K^u\}$, so that multiple LTE-U users and D2D pairs can transmit on the unlicensed channel concurrently.

B. Characteristics of LTE-U, D2D, and Wi-Fi Networks

In this part, we sequentially elaborate the PHY/MAC characteristics of the coexisting systems, i.e., LTE-U system and D2D links in the licensed/unlicensed bands, and existing Wi-Fi characteristics in the unlicensed band.

We assume that all devices transmit with fixed power in this work. Specifically, the transmit power of an LTE-U and D2D transmitter on any subchannel is fixed on P^c and P^d, respectively; and the transmit power of the APs as well as the Wi-Fi users over the whole unlicensed channel is fixed on P^w. The free space propagation path-loss model with Rayleigh fading is adopted to model the channel gain between any two devices in the network, i.e., for the link from device i to device j, the received power can be expressed as

$$p_{i,j}^r = p_i^t \cdot |h_{i,j}|^2 = p_i^t \cdot G \cdot d_{i,j}^{-\alpha} \cdot |h_0|^2, \tag{1}$$

where p_i^t represents the transmit power of user i, $d_{i,j}$ is the distance between devices i and j, α is the pathloss exponent, G is the constant power gains factor introduced by amplifier and antenna, and $h_0 \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ is a complex Gaussian variable representing Rayleigh fading. Besides, we assume that the thermal noise at each device satisfies independent Gaussian distribution with zero mean and the same variance σ^2.

1) LTE-U network and underlaid D2D pairs: In PHY layer, LTE-U users and D2D pairs can utilize both the licensed and unlicensed spectrum, in which the spectrum bandwidth is divided into a series of orthogonal subchannels. We assume that each user is able to occupy multiple subchannels in one subframe. In addition, to guarantee reliable transmission of the control signaling, an active LTE-U user or D2D pair must hold at least one licensed subchannel

[15]. Similar to the channel sharing in the licensed spectrum, D2D users can work as an underlay of the LTE-U users. In other words, D2D pairs can utilize the licensed/unlicensed subchannels concurrently occupied by some LTE-U users.

For the sake of Wi-Fi protection, the LTE-U/D2D system are not allowed to keep occupying the unlicensed channel forever. Instead, there exists reserved transmission period for the Wi-Fi systems, in which the LTE-U users and D2D pairs need to evacuate the unlicensed spectrum and allow the Wi-Fi systems enough time for transmission [15].

And as for the MAC layer, the LTE-U/D2D systems adopt a centralized MAC protocol. The BS controls the access of both types of users and decides the subchannel allocation in a centralized manner to mitigate mutual interference or maximize the system sum-rate.

2) Wi-Fi systems: The Wi-Fi systems operate only in the unlicensed spectrum. Different from the OFDMA-based channel utilization in LTE systems, the Wi-Fi transmission covers the whole unlicensed channel. Thus, Wi-Fi systems allow only one user to occupy the channel at a time, and concurrent transmission leads to collision.

For the MAC layer, without a central controller, the Wi-Fi systems adopt a sensing and contention-based MAC protocol, i.e., carrier sense multiple access with collision avoidance (CSMA/CA) [25]. Specifically, before transmission, a Wi-Fi user first listens to the intended channel. If the channel is unoccupied, the Wi-Fi user begins backoff process to avoid collision; otherwise, the Wi-Fi user keeps sensing until the channel is judged idle.

III. LBT-BASED D2D-U PROTOCOL

Inspired by the MAC protocol for LTE-U coexisting with Wi-Fi system in [26], in this section, we propose a LBT-based D2D-U protocol for the LTE-U and D2D users to share the unlicensed spectrum with Wi-Fi systems. The basic principle of the protocol is to allow the LTE-U and D2D users a chance to access the unlicensed spectrum while protecting the incumbent Wi-Fi performance. Note that the behavior of the LTE and D2D users on the licensed spectrum still follows the current LTE standard. In this paper, we only provide the protocol design for accessing the unlicensed spectrum in Fig. 2.



Fig. 2. LBT-based protocol for LTE and D2D users accessing the unlicensed spectrum.

A. Overview of the Proposed Protocol

As illustrated in Fig. 2, similar to the LTE standard, the timeline is slotted into subframes with length T_{sub} (e.g., 1ms in the LTE standard). There are three types of subframes, namely sensing subframes (SSs), transmission subframes, and reserved Wi-Fi subframes. The SSs are inserted before the LTE-U and D2D users attempt to initiate a transmission to avoid collision with the ongoing Wi-Fi transmissions. In transmission subframes, the LTE-U and D2D users perform transmission as in the conventional LTE standard. Then, to further protect the Wi-Fi performance, the long successive transmission period of LTE-U users and D2D pairs is followed by several reserved subframes for Wi-Fi transmission, during which the LTE-U and D2D users are not allowed to utilize the unlicensed spectrum. The transmission periods for LTE-U and D2D system as well as the Wi-Fi network can be adjusted according to their desired performance.

B. Structure and Deployment of Sensing Subframes

Once the reserved period for Wi-Fi transmission expires, LTE-U/D2D networks initialize an SS for spectrum sensing. The structure of an SS is depicted in Fig. 2. There are two rounds of sensing procedure, and each round resembles the CSMA mechanism in Wi-Fi networks.

1) First-round sensing: In the first round, all LTE and D2D users sense the whole unlicensed channel to avoid collision with the ongoing Wi-Fi transmission and seek for access opportunity. If the channel is sensed occupied at the whole period of the SS, the LTE-U/D2D users will keep

sensing in the next SS until at least one LTE-U/D2D users has competed for the unlicensed channel. If the channel is sensed idle without interruption for a distributed interference space (DIFS) T_i, each LTE-U/D2D user randomly selects an additional deferral time T_b and begin a backoff procedure as in CSMA to reduce the probability of collision with the contending Wi-Fi or other LTE-U and D2D users.

In the backoff procedure, each LTE-U/D2D user keeps sensing the channel, and judge whether other users turn active before its own backoff time expires. If no other transmissions are detected during a user's backoff time, it transmits a registration signal to inform the BS of starting data transmissions in the next subframe. To ensure that the registration signals are well received, the control signals are transmitted in a specified licensed control subchannel. Meanwhile, this user will transmit a reservation signal over one predefined unlicensed subchannel to reserve the unlicensed spectrum for LTE-U/D2D users in the next couple of subframes.

2) Second-round sensing: The second-round sensing will be performed only when the unlicensed channel is successfully reserved by at least one LTE-U/D2D user in the first-round sensing. Note that since the LTE-U and D2D users can utilize different subchannels to transmit concurrently, if the channel is reserved by some LTE-U/D2D users, the other contending LTE-U/D2D users still have the chance to access the unlicensed spectrum over other orthogonal subchannels. Given that the BS is not informed of the location and access strategy of all Wi-Fi users, and the Wi-Fi users typically transmit with lower power than the LTE-U users, it is hard for the BS to decide which LTE-U and D2D users can access the unlicensed channel and transmit concurrently with the ones that send the reservation signal.

To tackle this problem, the second-round sensing is designed for the pending LTE-U and D2D users to judge whether there exist access opportunities in a distributed manner. In the second-round sensing, each pending user selects one predefined subchannel to sense. If the subchannel is occupied, it moves to another random subchannel to avoid collision. Otherwise, it performs backoff as in the first round. A registration signal is transmitted to the BS when a user's backoff time expires informing that it can be allocated to unlicensed subchannels. The second-round sensing ends when all users have either tried to contend on all subchannels or transmitted registration signals on a certain subchannel.

Based on the received registration signal, at the end of the SS, the BS allocates the unlicensed and licensed subchannels to the LTE-U/D2D users with reservation in a centralized manner,

which is elaborated in Section V. If no registration signal is received, the BS broadcasts the message that the LTE-U/D2D network fails to retrieve the unlicensed spectrum in current SS over licensed channel, and the LTE-U/D2D users need to keep operating under the SS mode for channel contention until the LTE-U/D2D network successfully access the unlicensed spectrum.

IV. Problem Formulation

In this section, we first introduce the Wi-Fi performance model, and then formulate subchannel allocation problem considering both the performance of Wi-Fi and the total sum-rate of LTE users and D2D pairs.

A. Evaluation of Interference to Wi-Fi Systems

When LTE-U users and D2D pairs occupy the unlicensed channel, the nearby Wi-Fi users cannot access, and the performance of Wi-Fi system would be severely degraded. To quantify the performance degradation brought by LTE-U and D2D users, we introduce the concept of *interfering range* on the Wi-Fi network. The interfering range is defined as the area in which the Wi-Fi users can detect the reservation signal from the LTE-U/D2D users and suspend their transmission attempts. More specifically, each Wi-Fi user is able to detect the channel unavailable if the received signal power is beyond a certain threshold. With the free space path-loss model, if a LTE-U or D2D user is occupying the unlicensed spectrum, the interfering range to the Wi-Fi network is a circle centered at the transmitter, whose radius is positively related to the transmit power. Intuitively, the users with large interfering range has low probability of being allocated unlicensed subchannels, because large numbers of Wi-Fi users will be interfered by this user. On contrary, the users with small interfering range are more likely to be allocated unlicensed subchannels due to their limited interference to the Wi-Fi network.

However, when multiple LTE-U and D2D users transmit on the unlicensed spectrum concurrently, their individual interfering circles may overlap, which is hard to derive the closed form expression for the area of the total interfering range. For this reason, in the following of this part, we present an approximated model of the interfering range to evaluate the performance degradation in Wi-Fi system. Intuitively speaking, a smaller interfering range can be obtained if BS allocates the unlicensed subchannels to those users which are close to each other rather than those whose interfering ranges do not overlap. Inspired by this observation, we use the minimum



Fig. 3. Illustrations for interfering range.

distance between a new LTE-U/D2D user to others to approximate the additional interference introduced by this add-on user. Let L_c and L_d denote the radiuses of individual interfering circles of LTE-U and D2D users, respectively, where $L_d \leq L_c$. And we define $\mathcal{C}^u$ as the user set in which users are allocated to unlicensed subchannels. With these notations, the weight functions for LTE-U and D2D users are given as below.

1) LTE-U user: When the LTE-U user CU_n is allocated to the unlicensed subchannel the first time, and CU_j is an LTE-U user, the increased area of interfering range is related to the distance between CU_n and CU_j, denoted by $L^c_{n,j}$. When the interfering ranges of these two LTE users overlaps, i.e., $L^c_{n,j} < 2L_c$, as CU_1 and CU_2 in Fig. 3, we assume the weight is proportional to the distance $L^c_{n,j}$. And as CU_1 and CU_3 illustrated in Fig. 3, their interfering ranges do not overlap, i.e., $L^c_{n,j} \geq 2L_c$, the increased area will not grow as the distance $L^c_{n,j}$. Therefore, the weight function for the increased area $f^c_{n,j}$ can be expressed as

$$f^c_{n,j} = \begin{cases} L^c_{n,j}, & L^c_{n,j} < 2L_c, \\ 2L_c, & L^c_{n,j} \geq 2L_c. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, given a D2D pair D_m, the increased area of interfering range is also related to the distance between CU_n and D_m, $L^{c,d}_{n,m}$. Note that $L_d \leq L_c$, when the interfering range of D_m is contained by that of CU_n as CU_4 and D_4 in Fig. 3, i.e., $L^{c,d}_{n,m} \leq L_c - L_d$, the increased area is proportional to the increased diameter $2(L_c - L_d)$. When the interfering range of CU_n overlaps with but does not contain that of D_m as D_5 and CU_4, that is, $L_c - L_d < L^{c,d}_{n,m} < L_c + L_d$, the weight is proportional to the distance $L^{c,d}_{n,m}$ as well. Besides, when the interfering ranges of D_m

and CU_n do not overlap as CU_4 and D_3, i.e., $L_{n,m}^{c,d} \geq L_c + L_d$, the increased area is a constant. Therefore, the weight function for the increased area $f_{n,m}^{c,d}$ is written by

$$f_{n,m}^{c,d} = \begin{cases} 2(L_c - L_d), & L_{n,m}^{c,d} \leq L_c - L_d, \\ L_{n,m}^{c,d} + L_c - L_d, & L_c - L_d < L_{n,m}^{c,d} < L_c + L_d, \\ 2L_c, & L_{n,m}^{c,d} \geq L_c + L_d. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

The weight of an LTE-U user CU_n is the minimum increased interfering range between CU_n and any user allocated to unlicensed subchannels., that is,

$$f_n^c = \min_{j,m \in \mathcal{C}^u} (f_{n,j}^c, f_{n,m}^{c,d}). \tag{4}$$

2) D2D user: Similar to the LTE-U users, if D2D users D_m is allocated to the unlicensed subchannel the first time, and D_j is a D2D user utilizing unlicensed subchannels, the increased range is related to the distance between D_m^t and D_j^t. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the increased range can be calculated under two conditions: (1) the interfering ranges of these two D2D users overlap; (2) their interfering ranges do not overlap. Thus, the weight function $f_{m,j}^d$ between D_m and D_j is provided by

$$f_{m,j}^d = \begin{cases} L_{m,j}^d, & L_{m,j}^d < 2L_d, \\ 2L_d, & L_{m,j}^d \geq 2L_d. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

In addition, if there already exists one LTE-U user CU_n, the increased area $f_{n,m}^{c,d}$ is also related to the distance $L_{m,n}^{d,c}$ between CU_n and D_m, which can be given by

$$f_{n,m}^{c,d} = \begin{cases} 0, & L_{m,n}^{d,c} \leq L_c - L_d, \\ L_{n,m}^{c,d} + L_d - L_c, & L_c - L_d < L_{m,n}^{d,c} < L_c + L_d, \\ 2L_c, & L_{m,n}^{d,c} \geq L_c + L_d. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Therefore, the weight of D_m is

$$f_m^d = \min_{j,n \in \mathcal{C}^u} (f_{m,j}^d, f_{m,n}^{d,c}). \tag{7}$$

B. Interference in the LTE-U/D2D network

The mutual interference between he LTE-U and D2D users is analyzed in this subsection. Note that we do not consider scheduling in a subframe, i.e., an LTE-U user or a D2D pair can transmit on the allocated subchannels during the whole subframe. In addition, we assume

that one subchannel can be allocated to a maximum of one LTE user, and a subchannel can be allocated to at most V^s users for the sake of QoS. Besides, we also assume that a user can utilize at most V^u subchannels including licensed and unlicensed ones for the sake of fairness.

First, some notations regarding the subchannel allocation are listed as follow. The subchannel allocation matrix for LTE-U and D2D users is denoted by

$$A_{(N+M)\times(K+K^u)} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{N\times(K+K^u)} \\ \Theta_{M\times(K+K^u)} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where $\Phi_{N\times(K+K^u)} = [\phi_{n,k}]$, and $\Theta_{M\times(K+K^u)} = [\theta_{m,k}]$ stand for the subchannel allocation matrices for the LTE-U and D2D users, respectively. The values of $\phi_{n,k}$ and $\theta_{m,k}$ are defined as

$$\phi_{n,k} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{when subchannel SC}_k \text{ is allocated to CU}_n, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\theta_{m,k} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{when subchannel SC}_k \text{ is allocated to D}_m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Besides, we define the access indicators s_n^c $(n \in \mathcal{N})$ and s_m^d $(m \in \mathcal{M})$ to respectively represent whether the LTE and D2D users can access the unlicensed channel. If the LTE user CU_n can access the unlicensed channel, $s_n^d = 1$; otherwise, $s_n^d = 0$. And it is the same for D2D users. We also define $\mathcal{C}_k$ to represent the set of LTE and D2D users to which subchannel SC_k is allocated.

With this approximated model, the BS only needs to measure the distances between any two users applied for accessing the unlicensed spectrum, and evaluates the increased interfering range for each pending user compared to the current subchannel allocation scheme. The increased infering range is regarded as a penalty term in the subsequent subchannel allocation process.

1) Interference analysis in the licensed spectrum: In the licensed subchannels, under the assumption that a subchannel can be allocated to a maximum of one LTE user, the LTE-U users can only received the co-channel interference from the underlaying D2D pairs, while the interference received by D2D pairs might be from LTE-U users and other co-channel D2D users. The SINR at the receiver of BS from CU_n over licensed subchannel SC_k can be given by

$$\gamma_{n,k}^c = \frac{\phi_{n,k} P^c |h_{n,B}^c|^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum\limits_{m=1}^{M} \theta_{m,k} P^d |h_{m,B}^d|^2}, \tag{11}$$

where $h^c_{n,B}$ and $h^d_{m,B}$ represent the channel gains from CU_n and D^t_m to the BS, respectively. The SINR at the receiver of D2D user D_m over licensed subchannel SC_k can be expressed as

$$\gamma^d_{m,k} = \frac{\theta_{m,k} P^d |h^d_{m,m}|^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum\limits_{m \neq m', m'=1}^{M} \theta_{m',k} P^d |h^d_{m',m}|^2 + \sum\limits_{n=1}^{N} \phi_{n,k} P^c |h^c_{n,m}|^2}, \tag{12}$$

where $h^d_{m',m}$ and $h^c_{n,m}$ are the channel gains from $\text{D}^t_{m'}$ and CU_n to D^r_m, respectively. The data rates of CU_n and D_m over licensed subchannel SC_k are respectively given by

$$R^c_{n,k} = B_l \log_2(1 + \gamma^c_{n,k}), \;\; R^d_{m,k} = B_l \log_2(1 + \gamma^d_{m,k}). \tag{13}$$

2) Interference analysis in the unlicensed spectrum: In the unlicensed subchannels, the D2D-U and LTE-U users will not only receive the mutual interference from D2D-U and LTE-U users as in the licensed subchannels, but also the interference from the Wi-Fi system. Therefore, the SINR at the receiver of BS from CU_n over unlicensed subchannel SC_k is

$$\gamma^{c,u}_{n,k} = \frac{\phi_{n,k} P^c |h^c_{n,B}|^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum\limits_{m=1}^{M} \theta_{m,k} P^d |h^d_{m,B}|^2 + I^c_w}, \tag{14}$$

where I^c_w is the total interference from Wi-Fi system to BS, which can be calculated as $I^c_w = \sum\limits_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \frac{P^w}{K^u} |h^q_{f,B}|^2$, where $h^q_{f,B}$ is the channel gain from the transmitting Wi-Fi user WU^q_f associated with AP_q to BS. Similarly, the SINR at D^r_m over unlicensed subchannel SC_k can be written as

$$\gamma^{d,u}_{m,k} = \frac{\theta_{m,k} P^d |h^d_{m,m}|^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum\limits_{m \neq m', m'=1}^{M} \theta_{m',k} P^d |h^d_{m',m}|^2 + \sum\limits_{n=1}^{N} \phi_{n,k} P^c |h^c_{n,m}|^2 + I^d_w}, \tag{15}$$

where I^d_w is the interference from Wi-Fi system to D^r_m, whose value is $I^d_w = \sum\limits_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \frac{P^w}{K^u} |h^q_{f,m}|^2$, with $h^q_{f,m}$ representing the channel gain from the active WU^q_f to D^r_m.

The data rates of CU_n and D_m over unlicensed subchannel SC_k are respectively given by

$$R^{c,u}_{n,k} = B_u \log_2(1 + \gamma^{c,u}_{n,k}), \;\; R^{d,u}_{m,k} = B_u \log_2(1 + \gamma^{d,u}_{m,k}). \tag{16}$$

C. Sum-rate Maximization Problem Formulation

Our objective is to maximize the total sum-rate of the LTE and D2D users while minimizing the interfering range by setting the subchannel allocation variables $\{\phi_{n,k}, \theta_{m,k}\}$ in each subframe.[1]

[1]Note that we focus on allocating licensed and unlicensed subchannels to LTE and D2D users, the scheduling problem is not in the scope of this paper.

Since the BS does not hold the information of the interference from LTE-U and D2D users to Wi-Fi systems, we use the approximate model described in the Subsection IV-A to evaluate the performance degradation of Wi-Fi system, and add it in the objective function as a penalty term. Specifically, the penalty items W_n^c and W_m^d for CU_n and D_m are respectively given by

$$W_n^c = f_n^c \ \mathrm{sgn}\left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}^u} \phi_{n,k}\right),\ W_m^d = f_m^c \ \mathrm{sgn}\left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}^u} \phi_{m,k}\right). \tag{17}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}(\cdot)$ is the sign function.

Taking the penalty into consideration, the subchannel allocation can be formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{\{\phi_{n,k}\},\{\theta_{m,k}\}} \sum_{\mathcal{C}_k} \left(\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} R_{n,k}^c + R_{m,k}^d + \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}^u} R_{n,k}^{c,u} + R_{m,k}^{d,u}\right) - \lambda\left(\sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}} W_n^c + \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} W_m^d\right), \tag{18a}$$

$$s.t. \quad \sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}} \phi_{n,k} \le 1, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \tag{18b}$$

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}\cup\mathcal{K}^u} \phi_{n,k} \le V^u, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}\cup\mathcal{K}^u} \theta_{m,k} \le V^u, \forall m \in \mathcal{M}, \tag{18c}$$

$$\sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}} \phi_{n,k} + \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \theta_{m,k} \le V^s, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}\cup\mathcal{K}^u, \tag{18d}$$

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} \phi_{n,k} \ge 1, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} \theta_{m,k} \ge 1, \forall m \in \mathcal{M}, \tag{18e}$$

$$s_n^c \phi_{n,k} = \phi_{n,k}, s_m^d \theta_{m,k} = \theta_{m,k}, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}^u, \tag{18f}$$

where $\lambda \ge 0$ is the sensitivity factor for Wi-Fi systems. Constraint (18b) is given under the assumption that one subchannel can be utilized by at the maximum of one cellular user. Constraints (18c) and (18d) imply that a user utilize at most V^u subchannels, and a subchannel can be utilized by a maximum of V^s users. According to the CA property, each LTE-U or D2D-U user needs to be allocated at least one licensed subchannel for control signals, and thus constraint (18e) needs to be satisfied. Constraint (18f) is the sensing constraint, only the LTE-U and D2D-U users which have sensed that the channel is idle can access the unlicensed channel.

V. Many-to-Many Matching-Based Subchannel Allocation

The aforementioned problem is a MINLP problem, which is a NP-hard combinatorial optimization problem [27]. Considering the computational complexity, in this section, we reformulate the

subchannel allocation as a many-to-many two-sided matching problem, which can be efficiently solved by utilizing the matching games.

A. Matching Formulation

We consider the set of LTE and D2D users, $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$, and the set of subchannels including licensed and unlicensed, $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}^u$, as two disjoint sets of selfish players aiming to maximize their own benefits. Each player can exchange information with one another without extra signaling cost[2], that is, the players have complete information about others. In this many-to-many matching model, if subchannel SC_k is assigned to LTE user CU_n, then LTE user CU_n is said to be matched with subchannel SC_k, and form a matching pair, marked by $(\text{CU}_n, \text{SC}_k)$.

A matching is an assignment of subchannels in $\mathcal{S}$ to users in $\mathcal{U}$, which can be defined as:

Definition 1. *Given two disjoint sets, $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$ of the users, and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}^u$ of the subchannels, a many-to-many matching Ψ is a mapping from the set $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{S}$ to the set of all subsets of $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{S}$ such that for every user $CU_n \in \mathcal{N}$ or $D_m \in \mathcal{M}$, and subchannel $SC_k \in \mathcal{S}$:*

(1) $\Psi(CU_n) \in \mathcal{S}$, $\Psi(D_m) \in \mathcal{S}$;

(2) $\Psi(SC_k) \in \mathcal{U}$;

(3) $|\Psi(CU_n)| \leq V^u, |\Psi(D_m)| \leq V^u$;

(4) $|\Psi(SC_k)| \leq V^s$;

(5) $|\Psi(CU_n) \cap \mathcal{K}| \geq 1, |\Psi(D_m) \cap \mathcal{K}| \geq 1$;

(6) $s_m^d = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Psi(D_m) \cap \mathcal{K}^u = \emptyset$, $s_n^c = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Psi(CU_n) \cap \mathcal{K}^u = \emptyset$;

(7) $SC_k \in \Psi(CU_n) \Leftrightarrow CU_n \in \Psi(SC_k)$, $SC_k \in \Psi(D_m) \Leftrightarrow D_m \in \Psi(SC_k)$.

Conditions (1) and (2) state that each LTE or D2D user is matched with a subset of subchannels, and each subchannel is matched with a subset of users. Conditions (3) and (4) show the utilization constraints for a user and a subchannel. Due to the CA requirement, the users need to be allocated to at least one licensed subchannel, as expressed in condition (5). Condition (6) implies that only those users sensed idle unlicensed subchannel can be allocated to the unlicensed subchannels.

[2]The BS is assumed to have the full knowledge of the channel side information (CSI), and performs subchannel allocation based on the obtained CSI.

Considering mutual interference items in (12) and (15), any D2D pair's sum-rate over its allocated subchannels SC_k is related to the set of other LTE users and D2D pairs sharing this subchannel. Besides, the penalty term in (18a) indicates that the objective of the LTE-U and D2D users is relevant to other users operating in the unlicensed spectrum as well. Thus, each user cares about not only which subchannel it is matched with, but also the set of users matching with the same subchannel. For this reason, the aforementioned matching game is a many-to-many matching game with *externalities* [22] or *peer effects* [23].

Affected by the peer effects, the outcome of this matching game greatly depends on the dynamic interactions among the users sharing the subchannels. To better describe the selection behavior and decision process of each player, we introduce a concept of preference relation $>$ for both users and subchannels. For any two subchannels $\mathrm{SC}_k, \mathrm{SC}_{k'} \in \mathcal{S}, k \neq k'$, and any two matchings $\Psi, \Psi', SC_k \in \Psi(D_m), SC_{k'} \in \Psi'(D_m)$:

$$(\mathrm{SC}_k, \Psi) >_{D_m} (\mathrm{SC}_{k'}, \Psi') \Leftrightarrow R^d_{m,k}(\Psi) > R^d_{m,k'}(\Psi'), \tag{19}$$

where $R^d_{m,k}$ is related to the current subchannel allocation results. If D2D user D_m has not been allocated to unlicensed subchannels, the data rate $R^d_{m,k}$ needs to deduct the penalty item. This implies that the D2D user D_m prefers SC_k in Ψ to $\mathrm{SC}_{k'}$ in Ψ' if D_m can have a higher data rate over SC_k than $\mathrm{SC}_{k'}$. The same process will be done for an LTE user $\mathrm{CU}_n \in \mathcal{N}$. LTE-U user CU_n will also prefer the subchannel which can achieve higher data rate.

As for any subchannel $\mathrm{SC}_k \in \mathcal{S}$, its preference relation $>_{SC_k}$ over the set of users can be given in an uniform method. For any two subsets of users $T, T \in \mathcal{U}, T \neq T'$, and any two matchings $\Psi, \Psi', T = \Psi(SC_k), T' = \Psi'(SC_k)$:

$$(T, \Psi) >_{SC_k} (T', \Psi') \Leftrightarrow R_{SC_k}(\Psi) > R_{SC_{k'}}(\Psi'), \tag{20}$$

where R_{SC_k} also includes the penalty items. This indicates that subchannel SC_k prefers the set of users T to T' only when SC_k can get a higher data rate from T. $(T, \Psi) \geq_{SC_k} (T', \Psi')$ is also used to indicate that subchannel SC_k likes the set of users T at least as well as T'.

Different from traditional many-to-many matchings in which the players' preferences are substitutable, subchannels' preferences do not satisfy *substitutability*. Specifically, given a subchannel $\mathrm{SC}_k \in K$, let $\mathcal{T}_k \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ represent its most preferred user set that containing two D2D pairs D_m and D_i. Besides, the data rate $R^d_{m,k}$ of D_m is higher than $R^d_{i,k}$ of D_i when they utilize

subchannel SC_k independently. If $\mathrm{D}_m \notin \mathcal{T}_k$, then it is not necessary that $\mathrm{D}_i \in \mathcal{T}_k/\{D_m\}$. Due to the mutual interference, the data rate may have changed after D_m is removed from $\mathcal{T}_k$, and thus, SC_k may not prefer D_i any more.

Due to the externalities, the many-to-many matching model in this work is more complicated than the conventional two-sided matching models. Under traditional definition of stable matching[3] in [22], there is no guarantee that a stable matching exists even in many-to-one matchings. Because of the lack of substitutability, traditional deferred acceptance algorithm [22] cannot be applied to this model any more. To solve this matching problem, we introduce the swap matching [23] and propose a matching algorithm in Section V-B.

B. Subchannel Matching Algorithm for LTE-U Users and D2D Pairs

In this section, we propose a matching algorithm to solve the problem formulated in Section V. We first introduce the notations and definitions of *swap matching* and *stability* into our many-to-many matching model, and then elaborate on the matching algorithm.

1) Notations and Definitions: The concepts of *swap matching* and *swap-blocking pair* are defined as below.

Definition 2. *Given a matching Ψ, two matching pairs (U_i, SC_p) and (U_j, SC_q) with $SC_p \in \Psi(U_i)$, $SC_q \in \Psi(U_j)$, $SC_p \notin \Psi(U_j)$, and $SC_q \notin \Psi(U_i)$, **a swap matching** is defined as:*

$$\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q} = \{\Psi \backslash \{(U_i, SC_p), (U_j, SC_q)\}\} \cup \{(U_i, SC_q), (U_j, SC_p)\}. \tag{21}$$

A swap matching is generated via swap operations, which is the two-sided version of the *exchange* operation [28], [29]. In the swap operation, a pair of players exchange their matches while all other matchings remain unchanged. Different from conventional strategy change in one-to-one matching performed by the individual player, the swap operation needs to be approved by both involved players. In the following, we provide the conditions in which the swap operations can be approved by introducing the concepts of *swappable set* and *swap-blocking pair*.

[3]Traditional stable matching refers to a matching in which there do not exist two players from opposite sets prefer each other to at least one of their current matches such that they form a new matching pair together for the sake of their interests, that is, there are no blocking pairs in a stable matching.

Definition 3. *For LTE-U user CU_n or D2D pair D_m, its **swappable set** is defined as a subchannel subset in which the user can swap for subchannel via swap matching. Specifically, if the sensing vector $s_m^d = 1$, the swappable set Ω_m of D_m is subchannels set $\mathcal{S}$ including licensed and unlicensed ones; otherwise, its swappable set Ω_m is licensed subchannels set $\mathcal{K}$. And it does the same for LTE user CU_n.*

Note that only those users which have sensed that the channel is idle can access the unlicensed subchannel, the users failed to sense idle unlicensed subchannel can only swap for licensed subchannels in the swappable sets.

Definition 4. *Provided a matching Ψ and a pair $(U_i, U_j), U_i, U_j \in \mathcal{U}$, U_i and U_j are matched in Ψ, and let Ω_i and Ω_j respectively represent the swappable sets of U_i and U_j. If there exist subchannels $SC_p \in \Psi(U_i), SC_p \in \Omega_j$, $SC_q \in \Psi(U_j)$, and $SC_q \in \Omega_i$ such that:*

(1) $\forall t \in (U_i, U_j, SC_p, SC_q), (\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}, \Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}(t)) \geq_t (\Psi, \Psi(t))$,

(2) $\exists t \in (U_i, U_j, SC_p, SC_q), (\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}, \Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}(t)) >_t (\Psi, \Psi(t))$,

(3) $\forall t \in (U_i, U_j), |\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}(t) \cap \mathcal{K}| \geq 1$,

*then the swap matching $\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}$ is **approved**, and the pair (U_i, U_j) is called **a swap-blocking pair** in the matching Ψ.*

The third condition in definition 4 is to satisfy the CA requirement in which each user needs to utilize at least one licensed subchannel. The definition implies that once a swap matching is approved, at least one player's data rates will increase, which leads to the increase in the total data rate.

Definition 5. *A matching Ψ is **two-sided exchange-stable (2ES)** if and only if there does not exist a swap-blocking pair.*

Intuitively speaking, from the perspective of network, a matching Ψ is said to be 2ES implies that there is not any user U_i or subchannel SC_q, in which U_i prefers another subchannel SC_p to its match SC_q, or SC_q likes another user U_j rather than its match U_i. Such a network-wide stable can be achieved by guaranteeing the involved players are beneficial from the swap operations, given the externalities in current matching Ψ.

2) Algorithm Description: With the notations of swap matching and the definition of stability, we propose a user-subchannel matching algorithm (Algorithm 1) to obtain a 2ES matching. This algorithm is a extension of the many-to-one matching algorithm proposed in [30] with constraints that $|\Psi(CU_n)| \geq V^u$, $|\Psi(D_m)| \geq V^u$, and $|\Psi(SC_k)| \geq V^s$.

As a part of Algorithm 1, each LTE user or D2D pair needs to maintain a preference list. The preference list is established according to the following principles:

(1) The subchannels in the preference list need to be contained in the swappable set.
(2) The matched subchannel is removed from the preference list for each user.
(3) The subchannels which have matched with V^s users is removed from the preference list.
(4) If the user is unmatched, i.e., the user has not been allocated to any subchannels, the licensed subchannels have priorities over the unlicensed ones.
(5) The preference list is established based on the data rate over each subchannel.

In Algorithm 1, each user will send a proposal to the BS. According to definition 3, the proposed subchannel needs to be contained by swappable set. For each user, removing the matched subchannel is to avoid multiple proposals for the same subchannel. In addition, under the utilization constraints for a subchannel, the users can only send proposal to the available subchannels. The forth principle is designed in accordance with the CA requirement. This implies that if the user cannot compete for a licensed subchannel, the user needs to be silent. And according to the definition of preference relation in (19), the preference list is maintained based on the data rate. Due to the externalities, the preference list is dynamic in the swap matching process. Thus, in each iteration, the preference list will be updated based on the current matching.

The key idea of Algorithm 1 is to consider approving swap matchings among the players so as to obtain a 2ES matching. The algorithm is composed of two phases: initialization phase and swap matching phase. In the initialization phase, the BS will evaluate the channel gains for all users and interference from WiFi system. The swap matching phase contains multiple iterations in which the BS keeps executing the swap matching if there exist swap-blocking pairs, and updates the current matching. Note that the higher a user's data rate is, the higher probability it has to be accepted by the subchannel. In each iteration, the user U_i updates its preference list, and sends a proposal to the subchannel SC_q ranked the first in the preference list unless it has been matched with V^u subchannels. The acceptance can be regarded as a swap operation $\Psi_{i,0}^{0,q}$, where the element $\{0\}$ denotes a virtual user or subchannel. If this swap matching is approved,

Algorithm 1: User-Subchannel Matching Algorithm for LTE Users and D2D Pairs.

Input: Set of users $\mathcal{U}$; set of subchannels $\mathcal{S}$; sensing vectors s_n^c, s_m^d.
Output: A 2ES matching Ψ.
begin
  while $\Psi \neq \Psi'$ **do**
    Let $\Psi' = \Psi$;
    The preference lists are updated based on the current matching Ψ;
    if U_i *has not been matched with* V^u *subchannels* **then**
      U_i sends a proposal to the first subchannel SC_q in the preference list;
      if *swap operation* $\Psi_{i,0}^{0,q}$ *is approved* **then**
        User U_i matches with subchannel SC_q;
        The current matching Ψ is replaced by swap matching $\Psi_{i,0}^{0,q}$;
      else
        User U_i cannot get access to SC_q;
      end
      The BS searches for swap-blocking pairs;
      if *swap operation* $\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}$ *is approved* **then**
        User U_i exchanges its match SC_p with U_j for subchannel SC_q;
        The current matching Ψ is replaced by swap matching $\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}$;
      else
        User U_i keeps its match SC_p;
      end
    else
      User U_i keeps its matches.
    end
  end
  Terminate with the final matching result Ψ;
end

the proposed user U_i is accepted by the subchannel SC_q, and the matching is updated. Then, the BS will search other swap-blocking pairs and execute the swap matching to renew the current matching. The iterations stop until current matching is the same as the matching in the last iteration, and a final matching is determined.

VI. Performance Analysis

In this section, we analyze the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed algorithm, and remark some key properties of the LTE-U/D2D network. In the first part, the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed algorithm is proved. Then, the average number of SSs to retrieve unlicensed channel by LTE-U and D2D users is derived, which indicates the access efficiency of the LTE-U and D2D users. Finally, we discuss how the selection of the sensitivity factor λ impacts the subchannel allocation strategy at the end of this section.

A. Stability, Convergence, Complexity, and Optimality

Given the proposed Algorithm 1, we then give remarks on the stability, convergence, complexity, and optimality.

1) Stability and Convergence: We now provide the stability and convergence of Algorithm 1.

Lemma 1. *Phase II in Algorithm 1 converges after a limited number of swap operations.*

Proof: In each iteration of Algorithm 1, the matching Ψ is updated after a swap operation. Without loss of generality, we assume that after swap operation l, the matching result is updated by swap matching $\Psi_l = \Psi_{l-1}{}_{i,p}^{j,q}$. According to definition 4, after swap operation l, the sum-rates of subchannel SC_p and SC_q satisfy $R_{SC_p}(\Psi_l) \geq R_{SC_p}(\Psi_{l-1})$ and $R_{SC_q}(\Psi_l) \geq R_{SC_q}(\Psi_{l-1})$, and these two equations cannot hold at the same time, while the sum-rates of other subchannels remain unchanged. Therefore, the total sum-rate over all subchannels strictly increases.

Note that the number of potential swap-blocking pairs is finite since the number of users is limited, and the total sum-rate has an upper bound due to limited subchannels. Therefore, there exists a swap operation after which no swap-blocking pairs can be found and the total sum-rate stops increasing. Then Algorithm 1 converges. ■

Proposition 1. *Upon the convergence of Phase II, Algorithm 1 reaches a 2ES matching.*

Proof: The proof follows from these two considerations. First, the swap operations only occur when the players' data rate strictly increases. Second, due to the convergency of Phase II, for any user $U_i \in \mathcal{U}$, it cannot find another user $U_j \in \mathcal{U}$ to form a swap-blocking pair with their matches when Algorithm 1 terminates. The matches of user M_i must be the best choice for it in current matching. Hence, the terminal matching obtained by Algorithm 1 is 2ES. ■

2) Complexity: Having proved the convergence of Algorithm 1, we can then discuss its computational complexity.

Note that in the swap matching phase, a number of iterations are performed to reach the 2ES matching. In every iteration, the BS needs to search for swap-blocking pairs and all the approved swap operations are executed. Thus, the complexity of the swap matching phase lies in the number of both iterations and potential swap matchings in each iteration.

Proposition 2. *In the t-th iteration of Algorithm 1, at most $(M+N)*[(M+N-1)*(t-1)+1]$ swap matchings need to be considered.*

Proof: In each iteration of Algorithm 1, at most $M + N$ users sends proposal to the subchannels which rank first in their preference lists. Therefore, in this step, at most $M + N$ swap matchings need to be considered.

If the proposals from users are accepted by subchannels, they might execute swap matchings with the existing matches. For user U_i, it sends proposal to subchannel SC_p and is accepted. According to definition 2, this match can only execute swap matchings with matches which do not contain U_i and SC_p. In each iteration, at most 1 match can be added to the current matching for each user. Therefore, for match pair (U_i, SC_q), there are at most $(M + N - 1) * (t - 1)$ potential swap matchings in the t-th iteration. In the worst case, all the proposal for users are accepted by subchannels, and thus, there are a maximum of $(M + N) * (M + N - 1) * (t - 1)$ potential swap matchings.

Above all, at most $(M + N) * [(M + N - 1) * (t - 1) + 1]$ swap matchings need to be considered in the t-th iteration. In practice, one iteration requires a significantly low number of swap operations, since only a small number of proposals from users can be accepted. ■

3) Optimality: We show whether Algorithm 1 can achieve an optimal matching.

Proposition 3. *All local maxima of total sum-rate corresponds to a 2ES matching.*

Proof: Suppose the total data rates of matching Ψ is a local maximum value. If Ψ is not a 2ES matching, then there exists at least one swap-blocking pair, and any swap matching strictly increases data rates according to definition 2. However, this is in contradiction to the assumption that Ψ is a local maximum value. Therefore, Ψ must be 2ES. ■

However, not all 2ES matchings obtained from Algorithm 1 are local maxima of total data

rates. For example, there exists possibility that a user U_i does not approve a swap matching $\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}$ since its data rate will decrease, but the other user U_j will benefit from this swap matching, and the sum-rates of SC_p and SC_q increase as well. The total sum-rates will increase at the expense of stability if the swap operation is forced to execute.

To obtain a global optimum matching, we utilize a algorithm (GO Algorithm) proposed in [23] by utilizing a Markov chain Monte Carlo heat bath method. In GO Algorithm, the swap matching does not need to be approved any more, instead, a swap matching $\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}$ is executed with a probability P_{swap} which depends on the total sum-rate as shown below:

$$P_{swap} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-T[R_{total}(\Psi_{i,p}^{j,q}) - R_{total}(\Psi)]}}, \tag{22}$$

where T is a probability parameter. The algorithm keeps track of the optimum matching found so far, even as it moves to worse matchings. After sufficiently large amount of iterations, the matching moves towards the global optimal one [31].

B. Average Number of SSs to Retrieve Channel Access

Denote the average interval between two successive Wi-Fi transmission as T_{int}, and the average period of a successful Wi-Fi transmission as T_w. The average time length for the channel being sensed idle before the channel is reserved for an LTE user or D2D pair is approximated as $T_r = T_i + T_b/2$. The average number of SSs N_{ss} is closely dependent on the end of last Wi-Fi transmission. Therefore, we only need to consider how the WiFi transmission ends in a SS.

If the ongoing WiFi transmission ends no earlier than $T_{int} - T_r$ before SS begins, and no later than T_r before SS ends, i.e., the LTE user or D2D pair can sense the channel idle for a time of T_r and reserve this channel before another Wi-Fi transmission starts. As such, the LTE users and D2D pairs can utilize the unlicensed channel in next subframe. Therefore, the probability of an LTE user or D2D pair can successful access the unlicensed channel in a single subframe is calculated by

$$p_{suss} = [(T_{sub} - T_r) + (T_{int} - T_r)]/T_w. \tag{23}$$

Note that the probability of each user accessing the unlicensed channel follows independent identical distribution, the average number of SSs is $N_{ss} = 1/p_{suss}$.

C. Selection of the Sensitivity Factor λ

Let R_{max}^d be the maximum rate for a D2D pair in an unlicensed subchannel, R_{max}^c be the maximum rate for an LTE user, and generally $R_{max}^d/L_d \geq R_{max}^c/L_c$. How the value of the sensitivity factor λ tunes the performance can be analyzed in the following cases.

1) $\lambda \geq R_{max}^d/(2L_d)$*:* This case implies that neither a D2D pair or LTE user can get access to an unlicensed subchannel, the value of penalty terms is sufficiently large that cannot satisfy all the conditions of swap matching. Therefore, in this case, any D2D pairs or LTE users cannot be allocated to unlicensed subchannels, the LTE users and D2D pairs can only utilize the licensed spectrum for total sum-rate maximization.

2) $R_{max}^c/(2L_c) \leq \lambda \leq R_{max}^d/(2L_d)$*:* This case implies that a D2D user get access to unlicensed subchannels. In this case, any LTE users cannot be allocated to unlicensed subchannels. As for the D2D pairs, they can utilize both licensed and unlicensed subchannels. If one D2D pair get access to a unlicensed subchannel, those D2D pairs whose interfering ranges overlaps with the accessed one will become more easier to get access to the unlicensed subchannels because the increased interfering ranges will be less than that when this D2D pair is the first one to get access to the unlicensed subchannels. Thus, in the view of geography, those D2D pairs allocated to unlicensed subchannels trend to form several clusters.

3) $0 < \lambda < R_{max}^c/(2L_c)$*:* This case means that both LTE users and D2D pairs can get access to unlicensed subchannels. Similar to case 2, the users accessed to unlicensed subchannels also form several clusters. In addition, the accessed LTE users will decrease with the value of λ grows because of the large interfering range, that is, more unlicensed subchannels are allocated to D2D pairs and the LTE users are allocated to more licensed subchannels.

4) $\lambda = 0$*:* This case is the same as resource allocation problem in licensed scenario. In this case, both licensed and unlicensed subchannels can be regarded as a uniform subchannel, D2D pairs and LTE users will make full use of the whole spectrum to maximize the total sum-rate.

VII. Simulation Results

In this section, we present the simulation results of Algorithm 1, in comparison to the GO Algorithm, a greedy allocation algorithm, and the scenario without D2D, where all the users are LTE users. In the greedy scheme, the users will maintain a static preference list, and send proposal to the subchannels according to the preference list. We set the number of iterations

TABLE I

PARAMETERS FOR SIMULATION

LTE-U and D2D-U Parameters	Values
Cell radius	500 m
Maximum D2D pair distance D_{max}	20 m
LTE's transmit power P^c	13 dBm
D2D's transmit power P^d	3 dBm
Subchannel bandwidth B_l	180 kHz
Number of subchannels	40
Carrier frequency	1.9 GHz
Noise figure	5 dB
Decay factor of the path loss α	3
Power gains factor G	-31.5 dB
Maximum number of subchannels V^s	4
Maximum number of users V^u	4
Wi-Fi Parameters	**Values**
Number of subchannels	40
Subchannel bandwidth B_u	180 kHz
Wi-Fi user's transmit power P^w	23 dBm
Number of APs Q	3
LTE-U interfering radius L_c	50 m
LTE-U interfering radius L_d	23 m

as 10^6, $T = 0.5$ in GO Algorithm such that the outcome of GO Algorithm can be regarded as the upper bound of the total sum-rate. Note that the upper bound is unrealistic since the computational complexity is rather high. And the subchannels in the scenario without D2D are also allocated by Algorithm 1. For the simulations, we consider a single cell layout, where the LTE users and D2D pairs are distributed randomly, and the communication distance of D2D pairs cannot exceed a predefined value. The simulation parameters based on existing LTE/LTE-Advanced specifications [32] are given in Table I. Note that the transmission power of Wi-Fi user is over the whole unlicensed channel, while the transmission power of LTE or D2D user is over one subchannel.

Fig. 4 shows the total sum-rate vs. the number of active D2D pairs N, with the number of LTE users $M = 20$ and the sensitivity factor $\lambda = 0.1$. We observe that the spectrum efficiency increases with N. And it can be observed that the proposed Algorithm 1 performs much better



Fig. 4. Spectral efficiency vs. number of active D2D Pairs, with the number of LTE users $M = 20$ and $\lambda = 0.1$.



Fig. 5. Spectral efficiency vs. number of active D2D Pairs, with the number of LTE users $M = 20$.

than greedy algorithm and without D2D scenario while approaching the upper bound. This further implies that the BS can make full use of the unlicensed spectrum resources via D2D communications. The simulation results correspond to analysis in Section VI-A.

Fig. 5 shows the spectrum efficiency v.s. the number of active D2D pairs with the number of LTE users $M = 20$. It can be easily observed that the total sum-rate will decrease as the sensitivity factor λ increases. According to discussions on Section VI-C, $\lambda = 0$ means every D2D



Fig. 6. Interfering ranges vs. number of active D2D pairs, with the number of LTE users $M = 20$.

and LTE user can use unlicensed spectrum, the subchannels are sufficient and the total sum-rate is the maximum. $\lambda = 1$ means that almost they cannot use unlicensed spectrum, both LTE and D2D users can only utilize the licensed subchannels. Because there are half of subchannels can be utilized, the total sum-rate is close to the half of sum-rate with $\lambda = 0$. And $\lambda = 0.3$ implies that most LTE users cannot use unlicensed spectrum, most unlicensed subchannels are used by D2D pairs. Because of less available subchannels, the total sum-rates decreases.

In Fig. 6, we provide the interfering ranges vs. the number of active D2D pairs N with the number of LTE users $M = 20$. We use a uniform sampling and judge whether this sampling point is in the interfering range of any LTE user or D2D pair using the unlicensed spectrum. The percentage of sampling points in the interfering ranges is regarded as the interfering ranges. From Fig. 6, it can be observed that the interfering ranges will decrease as the value of sensitivity factor λ grows. We can also find out the the decrease in interfering ranges is at the expense of the total sum-rate from Fig. 6. We can learn that we can use the unlicensed spectrum according to different requirement for the interference by properly setting the value of λ.

Fig. 7 provides that the number of subchannels in both licensed and unlicensed spectrum vs. the value of sensitivity factor λ with the number of LTE users $M = 20$ and the number of D2D pairs $N = 20$. Based on the constraint that a user can utilize at most $V^u = 4$ subchannels, the total subchannels of LTE users or D2D pairs cannot exceed 80 subchannels. It can be also observed



Fig. 7. Number of subchannels vs. sensitivity factor λ, with the number of LTE users $M = 20$ and the number of D2D Pairs $N = 20$.

that when the value of λ increases, LTE users will be allocated to more licensed subchannels, while D2D pairs will utilize more unlicensed subchannels due to its smaller interfering ranges. This is consistent with the discussions in Section VI-C.

VIII. Conclusions

In this paper, we investigated the combination of D2D communication technology and LTE-U scenario, in which the D2D users operate as an underlay to the LTE-U system in both licensed and unlicensed spectrum. An LBT-based D2D-U access protocol has been designed for LTE-U and D2D users to access the unlicensed spectrum while protecting the existing Wi-Fi systems. Considering the complicated mutual interference between LTE-U, D2D, and Wi-Fi systems, we studied the subchannel allocation problem for D2D and LTE-U users sharing both licensed and unlicensed spectrum to leverage the performance degradation in Wi-Fi systems and the maximization of the sum-rate in LTE-U/D2D networks. Specifically, we formulated the allocation problem as a many-to-many matching game with externalities, and developed a low-complexity user-subchannel swap matching algorithm. Analytical and simulation results showed that enabling D2D communications in LTE-U network can significantly improve the network capacity. Besides, the subchannel allocation strategy for LTE-U and D2D users is closely related to how the BS adjusts the interference to Wi-Fi systems. In an aggressive strategy where the Wi-Fi performance

degradation is not considered seriously, the BS allows more D2D and LTE-U users to transmit on the unlicensed spectrum. On contrary, in a Wi-Fi friendly strategy, the BS tends to permit only a small fraction of D2Ds to transmit on the unlicensed spectrum, and most of the LTE-U users are only allocated with licensed subchannels.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Doppler, M. Rinne, C. Wijting, C. B. Ribeiro, and K. Hugl, "Device-to-Device Communication as an Underlay to LTE-advanced Networks", *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 42-49, Dec. 2009.

[2] L. Lei, Z. Zhong, C. Lin, and X. Shen, "Operator Controlled Device-to-Device Communications in LTE-advanced Networks", *IEEE Wireless Communication*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 96-104, Jun. 2012.

[3] G. Fodor, E. Dahlman, G. Mildh, S. Parkvall, N. Reider, G. Miklòs, and Z. Turányi, "Design Aspects of Network Assisted Device-to-Device Communications", *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 170-177, Mar. 2012.

[4] C. Xu, L. Song, Z. Han, Q. Zhao, X. Wang, X. Cheng, and B. Jiao, "Efficiency Resource Allocation for Device-to-Device Underlay Communication Systems: A Reverse Iterative Combinatorial Auction Based Approach", *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 348-358, Sep. 2013.

[5] L. Song, D. Niyato, Z. Han, and E. Hossain, *Wireless Device-to-Device Communications and Networks*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2015.

[6] C. H. Yu, K. Doppler, C. B. Ribeiro, and O. Tirkkonen, "Resource Sharing Optimization for Device-to-Device Communication Underlaying Cellular Networks", *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 2752-2763, Aug. 2011.

[7] H. Min, J. Lee, S. Park, and D. Hong, "Capacity Enhancement Using an Interference Limited Area for Device-to-Device Uplink Underlaying Cellular Networks", *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 3995-4000, Dec. 2011.

[8] A. Aijaz, H. Aghvami, and M. Amani, "A Survey on Mobile Data Offloading: Technical and Business Perspectives," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 104-112, Apr. 2013.

[9] K. Lee, J. Lee, Y. Yi, I. Rhee, and S. Chong, "Mobile Data Offloading: How Much Can WiFi Deliver?" *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 536-550, Apr. 2013.

[10] M. Bennis, M. Simsek, A. Czylwik, W. Saad, S. Valentin, and M. Debbah, "When Cellular Meets WiFi in Wireless Small Cell Networks?" *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 44-50, Jun. 2013.

[11] H. Dong, P. Wang, and D. Niyato, "A Dynamic Offloading Algorithm for Mobile Computing," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 1991-1995, Jun. 2012.

[12] Y. Gu, Y. Zhang, L. X. Cai, M. Pan, L. Song, and Z. Han, "Exploiting Student-Project Allocation Matching for Spectrum Sharing in LTE-Unlicensed", in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, San Diego, CA, Dec. 2015.

[13] 3GPP TR 36.808, "Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Carrier Aggregation; Base Station (BS) radio transmission and reception", Release 10, Jul. 2013.

[14] A. Al-Dulaimi, S. Al-Rubaye, Q. Ni, and E. Sousa, "5G Communications Race: Pursuit of More Capacity Triggers LTE in Unlicensed Band", *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 43-51, Mar. 2015.

[15] R. Zhang, M. Wang, L. X. Cai, Z. Zeng, X. Shen, and L. Xie, "LTE-Unlicensed: The Future of Spectrum Aggregation for Cellular Networks", *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 150-159, Jun. 2015.

[16] Y. Chao, H. Zhang, and L. Song, “Demo: WiFi Multihop - Implementing Device-to-Device Local Area Networks by Android Smartphones”, in *ACM International Symposium on Mobile ad hoc Networking and Computing (MobiHoc)*, Hangzhou, P.R. China, June. 2015.

[17] D. Karvounas, A. Georgakopoulos, K. Tsagkaris, V. Stavroulaki, and P. Demestichas, “Smart Management of D2D Constructs: An Experiment-Based Approach”, *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 82-89, Apr. 2014.

[18] WiFi Alliance, “Wi-Fi peer-to-peer (P2P) technical specification,” 2010.

[19] B. Di, S. Bayat, L. Song, and Y. Li, “Radio Resource Allocation for Downlink Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access (NOMA) Networks Using Matching Theory”, in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, San Diego, CA, Dec. 2015.

[20] H. Zhou, B. Liu, Y. Liu, N. Zhang, L. Gui, X. S. Shen, and Q. Yu, “A Cooperative Matching Approach for Resource Management in Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks”, *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 1047-1057, Feb. 2014.

[21] O. Semiari, W. Saad, S. Valentin, M. Bennis, and H. V. Poor, “Context-Aware Small Cell Networks: How Social Metrics Improve Wireless Resource Allocation”, *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 14, no. 11, pp. 5927-5940, Nov. 2015.

[22] A. Roth, and M. Sotomayor, “Two-Sided Matching: A Study in Game-Theoretic Modeling and Analysis”, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1992.

[23] E. Baron, C. Lee, A. Chong, B. Hassibi, and A. Wierman, “Peer Effects and Stability in Matching Markets”, in Giuseppe Persiano, editor, *Algorithmic Game Theory*, volume 6982 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pp. 117-129, Springer Berlin/Heidelberg, 2011.

[24] J. Fu, X. Zhang, L. Cheng, Z. Shen, L. Chen, and D. Yang, “Utility-Based Flexible Resource Allocation for Integrated LTE-U and LTE Wireless Systems”, in *IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, Glasgow, UK, May 2015.

[25] K. R. Malekshan, W. Zhuang, and Y. Lostanlen, “An energy efficient MAC protocol for fully connected wireless ad hoc networks”, *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Commununications*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 5729-5740, Oct. 2014.

[26] R. Zhang, M. Wang, L. X. Cai, X. Shen, L. L. Xie, and Y. Cheng, “Modeling and Analysis of MAC Protocol for LTE-U Co-Existing with Wi-Fi”, in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, San Diego, CA, Dec. 2015.

[27] D. A. Plaisted, “Some Polynomial and Integer Divisibility Problems Are NP-HARD”, in *1976 Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Houston, TX, Oct. 1976.

[28] K. Cechlarova and D. Manlove, “The Exchange-Stable Marriage Problem”, *Discreate Applied Mathematics*, vol. 152, no. 1-3, pp. 109-122, Nov. 2005.

[29] R. Irving, “Stable Matching Problems With Exchange Restrictions”, *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 344-360, Mar. 2008.

[30] F. Pantisano, M. Bennis, W. Saad, S. Valentin, and M. Debbah, “Matching with Externalities for Context-Aware User-Cell Association in Small Cell Networks”, in *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, Atlanta, GA, Dec. 2013.

[31] O. Haggstrom, “Finite Markov Chains and Algorithmic Applications”, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2001.

[32] 3GPP TS 36.213, “Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA) Physical Layer Procedures”, Release 12, Sep. 2014.